

**Remarks: General**

The claims have been amended by rewriting Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 20, 21 and 25 for the purpose of presenting therein a more detailed description of certain features of particular interest that are included among the various embodiments of this invention. Claims 23, 24 and 28 have been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. With the cancellation of Claims 23, 24 and 28, Claims 1~22, 25~27 and 29~38 are now active in the application.

Terminology or other subject matter that may not have been present in the claims as originally filed has been inserted by amendment to certain existing claims. No new matter is being thereby incorporated, however, as basis in the specification for the various amendments is as follows:

in Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 20 and 21, support for the recitation as to the determinations made as to the named gases may be found in original Claims 23, 24 and 28, and in the discussion on page 50 at lines 13~35.

A terminal disclaimer for this application over U.S. Patent 6,849,239 is enclosed, the fee for which should be charged to Deposit Account No. 04-1928 (E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company).

A petition under 37 CFR §1.136 for a one-month extension of time to respond to the outstanding action is enclosed, the fee for which should be charged to Deposit Account No. 04-1928.

By Applicant's calculation, no fee is due by reason of this amendment to the claims. If, however, that calculation is in error, or if any fee other than or in addition to those mentioned specifically above is required to authorize or obtain consideration of this response, please charge any required fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1928.

Applicant hereby requests entry of the above described amendments, and requests reconsideration and further examination of

Application No. 10/810,770  
Confirmation No. 9071  
Art Unit 1797, Examiner Ramdhanie  
Docket No. CL2218 US NA  
July 21, 2008  
Page No. 27 of 29

the application in view of those amendments and the reasons it has set forth below for allowance of the claims.

### **Remarks: Detailed Action**

#### I.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1~6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by EP 806,657 (“Smith”), and has rejected Claims 1, 23~29, 31~34 and 36~38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,542,640 (“Clifford”). Claims 23, 24 and 28 have been cancelled.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1~6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith; has rejected Claims 7~22 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clifford in view of US 4,347,732 (“Leary”); and has rejected Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clifford.

While the cited references mention the use of a variety of different gas sensing materials, the references do not individually or together teach or suggest an apparatus in which the materials have been selected such that the apparatus has the ability to make determinations about ammonia, one or more nitrogen oxides, and a hydrocarbon, as recited in the amended claims.

In view of the above distinctions between the cited references and the subject matter of the pending claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections of the pending claims.

#### II.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1~38 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1~136 of U.S. Patent 6,849,239. Claims 23, 24 and 28 have been cancelled. As Applicant is submitting herewith a terminal disclaimer for this application over the cited patent, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the double-patenting rejection of the pending claims.

Application No. 10/810,770  
Confirmation No. 9071  
Art Unit 1797, Examiner Ramdhanie  
Docket No. CL2218 US NA  
July 21, 2008  
Page No. 29 of 29

III.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings with respect to the y-axis in Figure 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the y-axis in Figure 1 does not need a numerical scale because, as discussed on pages 10~11 of the specification, Figure 1 is not intended to show a specific amount of resistance for each sensor, rather it is intended to show that the same array of sensors will give a different pattern of response values when it is exposed to one gas (or mixture) as compared to the occasion when it is exposed to a different gas (or mixture).

Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of the drawings.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections have been properly traversed, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, request for which is hereby respectfully made.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Langworthy/

John A. Langworthy  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 32,255  
Telephone: (302) 992-4362  
Facsimile: (302) 992-5374